

May 17, 2007

Reply to the Office Action dated December 19, 2006 and
the Advisory Action dated April 17, 2007

Page 8 of 10

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 7-10 and 22-30 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants amend Claims 7, 23, and 30.

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. Applicant amended Claim 23 in the Amendment filed on March 16, 2007 to correct the informality noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 7-10 and 22-30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Aoshima et al. (U.S. 6,241,524). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 7-10 and 22-30.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite:

A game device for proceeding a game by placing game objects related to the game in a three-dimensional virtual space and by controlling said objects, comprising:

first game proceeding means for proceeding the game by controlling said game objects in a first game field in said three-dimensional virtual space;

second game proceeding means for proceeding the game by controlling said game objects in a second game field in said three-dimensional virtual space;

cursor object forming means for forming a cursor object indicating a certain area of one of said first and second game fields as well as an area of the other game field corresponding to the certain area; and

perspective transformation display means for forming a screen picture on a display by transforming coordinates of each object including said cursor object within view of a viewpoint located in said three-dimensional virtual space; wherein

the cursor object is a three-dimensional object extending over both of the first game field and the second game field. (emphasis added)

Applicants' Claims 22 and 30 recite features and method steps that are similar to the features recited in Applicants' Claim 7, including the above-emphasized features.

May 17, 2007

Reply to the Office Action dated December 19, 2006 and
the Advisory Action dated April 17, 2007

Page 9 of 10

The Examiner alleged that Aoshima et al. teaches all of the features and method steps recited in each of independent Claims 7, 22, and 30, including first and second game fields and cursor object forming means.

Applicants' Claim 7 has been amended to recite the feature of "the cursor object is a three-dimensional object extending over both of the first game field and the second game field." Applicants' Claims 22 and 30 have been similarly amended. Support for this feature is found, for example, in Figs. 11 and 12 and in the paragraph bridging pages 30 and 31 through the paragraph bridging pages 31 and 32 of the originally filed application.

The Examiner referred to Fig. 3 and reference numbers 500 and 510 of Aoshima et al. as allegedly teaching the cursor object forming means. However, neither of reference numbers 500 and 510 is or could be fairly construed as a cursor object forming means as recited in Applicants' Claim 7, and similarly in Applicants' Claims 22 and 30. In contrast, Aoshima et al. specifically discloses that elements 500 and 510 are "futuristic tanks" which are merely objects that are independent from one another and that are displayed in only a single game field. At best, the futuristic tanks 500 and 510 of Aoshima et al. most closely correspond to the game objects recited in Claims 7, 22, and 30, and certainly cannot be fairly construed as the cursor object forming means because elements 500 and 510 (1) do not indicate any specific area of a game field, (2) cannot indicate a certain area of multiple game fields at the same time, and (3) are not capable of extending over two game fields.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Aoshima et al. clearly fails to teach or suggest the features of "cursor object forming means for forming a cursor object indicating a certain area of one of said first and second game fields as well as an area of the other game field corresponding to the certain area" and "the cursor object is a three-dimensional object extending over both of the first game field and the second game field" as recited in Applicants' Claim 7, and similarly in Applicants' Claims 22 and 30.

Serial No. 10/754,061

May 17, 2007

Reply to the Office Action dated December 19, 2006 and
the Advisory Action dated April 17, 2007

Page 10 of 10

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 7, 22, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Aoshima et al.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art of record, applied alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Claims 7, 22, and 30 of the present application.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 7, 22, and 30 are allowable. Claims 8-10 and 23-29 depend upon Claims 7 and 22, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claims 7 and 22 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a Two-Month Extension of Time, extending to May 21, 2007 (May 19, 2007 falls on a Saturday), the period for response to the Office Action dated December 19, 2006.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 17, 2007

/Christopher A. Bennett #46,710/
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102
Telephone: (703) 637-1480
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710